

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/606,653	06/26/2003	Chester Savage	SCH-031090 C2	4703
30981	7590 04/15/200-	ı	EXAM	IINER
King & Jova	anovic, PLC		BUECHNER,	PATRICK M
170 College A SUITE 230	Avenue		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
HOLLAND, MI 49423			3754	
			DATE MAIL ED: 04/15/200	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			\sim			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	n()			
	10/606,653	SAVAGE ET AL.	N			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	()			
	Patrick M Buechner	3754				
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sh et w	ith the correspondence addre	ess			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory pe - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by st Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the m earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a . I reply within the statutory minimum of thi R riod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO atute, cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed rly (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this comm BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	unication.			
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2	<u>6 June 2003</u> .					
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☑ 1						
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	·—					
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) 2-8 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 2-6 and 8 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) 7 is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	drawn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exam	niner.					
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>26 June 2003</u> is/are	: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ obje	ected to by the Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to		· ·				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the cor 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	·		• •			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docum 2. Certified copies of the priority docum 3. Copies of the certified copies of the papplication from the International But * See the attached detailed Office action for a	nents have been received. nents have been received in a priority documents have been reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No n received in this National Sta	age			
Attachment(s)	_					
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 		Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date				
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB Paper No(s)/Mail Date	′	Informal Patent Application (PTO-15	52)			

Application/Control Number: 10/606,653

Art Unit: 3754

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. All references of record in parent applications 10/108,117 and 09/709,144 have been considered. However, as applicant has failed to list the patents on a FORM PTO-1449, they will not be printed on the face of any patent issuing from this application. Should applicant wish these references to be printed, a FORM PTO-1449 listing those patents should be provided.

Oath/Declaration

2. A new oath or declaration is required because, while normal in a continuing application the original declaration will suffice, changes may not be made to the original declaration. Here applicant has modified the original declaration with non-initialed changes in order to alter the power of attorney. This is improper and a new declaration is required. The wording of an oath or declaration cannot be amended. If the wording is not correct or if all of the required affirmations have not been made or if it has not been properly subscribed to, a new oath or declaration is required. The new oath or declaration must properly identify the application of which it is to form a part, preferably by application number and filing date in the body of the oath or declaration. See MPEP §§ 602.01 and 602.02.

Double Patenting

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground

Application/Control Number: 10/606,653

Art Unit: 3754

provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

- 4. Although a restriction requirement was made in parent application 09/709144, the claims in the current application differ from those in 09/709144 which required restriction.
- 5. Claims 2-4 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 6 of U.S. Patent No. 6,607,097. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the structure claimed in the current application is inherent in the method claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,607,097.

The claims of the current application correspond to the claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,607,097 as follows in Table I.

Claims in application 10/606653	Claims in U.S. Patent No. 6,607,097
2	1
3	1, 6
4	1, 6

Table I

6. Claim 5, 6 and 8 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 3-5 of U.S. Patent No. 6,607,097 in view of Tomic (US 5,743,435).

The method claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,607,097 inherently disclose the structure claimed in claims 5, 6, and 8, (see Table II below) with the exception of the spout having a flange.

Application/Control Number: 10/606,653 Page 4

Art Unit: 3754

Claims in application 10/606653	Claims in U.S. Patent No. 6,607,097
5	1, 3
6	1, 3, 5
8	1, 3, 4

Table II

Tomic teaches a spout (18) having a flange with fluid pathways (52) located on the inner surface.

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the spout of U.S. Patent No. 6,607,097 with the flange, with fluid pathways on the inner surface, as taught by Tomic.

Doing so would provide for more sealing surface between the spout and the bag.

Allowable Subject Matter

- 7. Claim 7 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 8. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:
 The prior art does not disclose or fairly teach the collapsible bag and spout with a flange, as claimed, including concentric fluid pathways on the flange of the spout.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Haberhauer (US 3,690,524), Gammons et al. (US 4,149,541), Meginnis et al. (US 4,269,032), Kosuth (US 5,178,021) and Frazier et al. (US 6,179,173).

Application/Control Number: 10/606,653 Page 5

Art Unit: 3754

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patrick M Buechner whose telephone number is (703) 308-2602. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00am-4:30pm M-Th and alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gene Mancene can be reached on (703) 308-2696, or the examiner's temporary supervisor can be reached at (703) 308-2580. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

∫∂ PB

GREGORY L. HUSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700